

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

VOL. III.

SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1834.

NO. 25.

PUBLISHED SIMULTANEOUSLY IN NEW-YORK
AND PHILADELPHIA.

EDITED BY

T. J. Sawyer, A. C. Thomas, and P. Price.

P. PRICE, PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR.

TERMS—Two Dollars per ann. in advance, or \$2.50 if not paid within six months. Publishing offices No. 2 Marble-Building, Chatham-Square, (front of the Bowery) New-York, and No. 182 Chestnut-street, Philadelphia.

Letters to be addressed, (post paid) "P. Price, No. 2 Chatham-Square, New-York."

[Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year
1834, by P. Price, in the Clerks Office of the
Southern District of New-York.]

ANSWERS

TO

"213 Questions without Answers,"

By D. De Vinne,

WITH REJOINDERS,

By A. C. Thomas.

46. Can finite man frustrate the purposes of the Almighty?

A. No, not His purposes, but remember there is a difference between purpose and design. The Lord has His purposes and fixed plan of government, from which the actions of a free agent cannot divert Him. Is an event to be performed or one to be prevented, we must remember, 1. That the Lord has a thousand ways to accomplish these objects *without interfering* with man's free agency. For instance, has an assassin determined to waylay and kill a good man whom the Lord intends, or purposes to live longer on the earth, now without depriving him of moral liberty he may lay the assassin upon a *bed* of affliction, or cause his murderous weapon to miss its object. 2. If an event had not happened in *one way* it might have been brought about in *an other*. The Lord had purposed in the case of Jacob and Esau that the elder should serve the younger, but he never could have determined to bring that event about by deception and lies. Had Rebecca and Jacob left the event to God he would have brought it about, probably as he did the same thing between Ephraim and Manassah, by crossing the hands of the Father in conferring the blessing, or in some other way agreeable to his perfections. 3. The Lord does not need the sins of men to bring about his purposes. He can bring them about in his own most holy way, although in the government of the world he may manage the free acts of wicked agents so as to make their *wrath praise him*. He may use an Alexander, an Attila, or a Napoleon to scourge the nations of the earth, but he could have accomplished the same end by a famine, the cholera, or any other judgment.

Rej. In the above Answer we have a *distinction* without a *difference*. In what differs *design* from *purpose*? "To *design*: to purpose' to intend any thing." "To *purpose*: to intend, to design, to resolve." [Johnson.] The *substantive* has essentially the same meaning. If a man cannot frustrate the *purposes* of Deity, surely he cannot frustrate his *designs*. When he designed universal salvation, he purposed it. "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his *good pleasure*, which he hath *PURPOSED* in himself, [not in the creature] that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one *ALL THINGS* in Christ."—Eph. i, 9, 10. "The Lord of hosts hath purposed, and who shall disannul it?" Isa. xiv, 27.

47. Is every individual under obligation to be thankful for his existence?

A. Yes. For certainly it is a blessing to be an intelligent being, to enjoy life and have the prospect of eternal felicity. But those blessings place man upon *responsible ground*. Where there is glory to be won, there is danger to be met. But who is so brutish that he would not desire to struggle in the arena with temptations and vice, when he *knows* that he *may* cover himself with eternal glory. In this warfare, he knows that there is no necessity that he should fall; omnipotence is on his side and will never suffer him to be tempted *above what he is able to bear*; and should he even fall a thousand times, thro' grace he may recover himself and finally triumph. Now I say who would not bless God for an existence under such circumstances; 1. He may enjoy much even in this life; 2. He never shall be tempted beyond his ability to resist; 3. Should he fall a thousand times he may repent and recover himself; and 4. He will never finally be cast off until he has rejected more than ten thousand offers of eternal life. I say ten thousand offers, for the Law of God says to us now, as it did to Adam, "In the day thou sinnest thou shall surely die."—The sinner breaks God's law, justice says cut him down, the Lord spares him and gives him another opportunity: he sins the second time, he is spared and a second offer is given him, and so the third, beyond numbers or the power of recollection, so unwilling is the Holy Spirit to give him up, that in his own words, he cries "O how can I give thee up." And yet the framer of these Questions intimates that an existence under the above circumstances, is not a blessing. We may say to those who desire non-existence as Dr. Young did,

"It is an after-thought,
A monstrous wish unborn, till virtue dies."

Rej. I do say, Dr. Young to the contrary notwithstanding, that *no man* in his proper senses, if he has a realizing sense of *never-ending woe*, and *feels* his liability to it, can consider life a blessing, for which he is bound to be thankful. Who would consent to be thrown into a den of lions, on condition that, if he should escape with life, he should receive ten thousand dollars? Since the respondent has quoted Dr. Young, he may perhaps be disposed to read the following from that eminent poet. The damned sinner is represented as making an appeal—the force of which must have been felt by the writer—

"Why burst the barriers of my peaceful grave?
Ah! cruel death! that would no longer save,
But grudged me e'en that narrow, dark abode,
And cast me out into the wrath of God.
Ah! Mercy! Mercy! art thou dead above?
Is love extinguished in the source of Love?
"Father of Mercies! why from silent earth
Didst thou awake and curse me into birth?
Tear me from quiet, ravish me from night,
And make a thankless present of thy light?"
"The beasts are happy, they come forth and keep,
Short watch on earth, and then lie down to sleep."

48. Will this obligation eternally continue?

A. Certainly.

49. Can any one be thankful for that, which on the whole, is not a blessing?

A. The predicate is not true, for existence is a blessing, but if it afterwards becomes a curse, the sufferer *made it so*. You give a thousand

pounds to help a friend in business; but he spends your gift to his own injury, in dissipation and comes to a premature grave. Was not your gift a blessing, *though he made it a curse*?

Rej. The latter Question is not answered. Existence to be, *on the whole* a blessing, must furnish more happiness than misery, more pleasure than pain. Were I to give a thousand pounds to keep a friend in business, *knowing* at the time, that it would be his ruin, the gift would *not* be a blessing—it would be a curse.

50. If any one be rendered endlessly miserable, will he still be under obligation to thank God for existence?

A. Yes, for he should not have made himself thus miserable.

Rej. Endless misery, brought about by whatever circumstances, would over-balance any amount of happiness that existence might previously have afforded—and consequently existence in interminable wretchedness is in no sense a blessing. God does not require the performance of impossibilities; and no man can be justly under obligation to be thankful for an existence in utterable torment.

51. Would endless misery benefit the Almighty as the *inflictor*?

A. No, for properly we cannot benefit him at all, even by our good deeds. But punishment will be a striking demonstration of his justice and will deter others from sin.

Rej. It is, then, acknowledged that endless misery cannot benefit the Almighty. *Who* will it deter from sin? The saints?—the angels?—*who*?

52. Would endless misery benefit the saints, as *spectators*?

A. It will be to them and perhaps to other worlds and systems an awful exhibition of his holiness—and that "He is the righteous Lord—of purer eyes than to behold evil,—one who cannot look upon iniquity." This display of his holiness and justice must give them also a higher reverence for his character.

Rej. We have nothing to do with the word *perhaps*. The saints would certainly enjoy a feast of fat things in beholding the endless damnation of their relatives and friends! O how a mother would reverence the Almighty, were she to see her son writhing in the flames of hell!! "There is joy in heaven over" the unspeakable torture of kindred!!

53. Would endless misery benefit the sinner, as he *sufferer*?

A. No, not after he has fallen under its awful penalty but it *might have benefitted* him, had he believed God's word which threatened it.—The design of punishment is to deter from sin, and had not this been threatened, and in case of delinquency, actually carried into execution, the most effectual means *had not been made use of* to prevent sin. Again if nothing less than the most tremendous penalty of eternal death, would deter men from sin, the love which God had for the human race, would even cause him to institute that as the best way to guard men from sin.

Rej. I did not ask what *might* have been—but "Would endless misery benefit the sinner, as the sufferer?" Why not be honest, and answer the Question fairly?—See Rejoinder under Q. 2, fourth paragraph.

54. If endless punishment be the "wages of sin," could the sinner ever receive payment in full?

A. No.

Rej. Then God has agreed to pay *wages* which he is not able to pay! The *utmost* farthing is to be paid—but if endless misery be true, when is it to be paid? Clarke says that the word *wages* in Rom. vi, 23, signified the *daily pay* of a Roman Soldier.

55. As man is a finite being, can he commit an infinite sin?

A. Yes. He may commit a sin the *consequences* of which, on himself, and perhaps on others, may run on forever. It must be remembered that although man began to exist yesterday, yet his future being will extend to infinity. Could not a man in one moment, maim himself by cutting off a hand or foot? Now were he to live as old as Methusaleh, or be induced with immortality in this state without a direct miraculous interposition of Almighty power, he would *forever be destitute* of these limbs; consequently the act which a finite creature did in a moment, would be infinite in its effects.

And have we not equal reason to believe, that a sinner, during a long course of sin, by committing wicked acts, and indulging evil passions and propensities, may *commit such a trespass* upon his soul as to entirely unfit him for thinking or acting right? The moral powers of his soul may be so maimed and ruined by sin, that he may be as incapable of doing right as a mute is of singing or a cripple of running a race. In a word he may lose his moral liberty and fall wholly under the power of sinful habits. We have instances of this truth almost every day. The poor drunkard has lost almost all power to resist. The strength of habit which is growing upon him every day, may be compared to an irresistible current in the channel of a river; while the boatman is near the shore, he can pass up and down at pleasure, but as he ventures out he finds the current stronger, for some time he is capable of resisting it, he ventures on till at last it overpowers him, and in spite of all his efforts, he is carried irresistibly over the awful precipice and dashed to pieces. Do we not see those around us who are loosing their power of resistance and have we not read of those who so lost it, *That it was impossible to renew them again to repentance?*—To say that God is obliged to restore it, by an immediate interposition of power as often as the sinner chooses to sin it away, is an affrontery which, I presume, the framer of these Questions would not assert. And now we say again that a finite creature may commit an infinite offence, he may loose his moral liberty and so maim the faculties of his soul as to unfit him forever to resist evil, or to love or serve God.

Rej. I grant that a man may in a moment maim himself by cutting off a hand or foot, which could not be restored were he to live to the age of Methusaleh. It should be added that neither *faith* nor *repentance* could restore the loss. *Carry out* the analogy, else allow that the illustration is nothing but an array of words without meaning. The respondent supposes that the *faith* and *repentance* of a man who has maimed his moral powers may restore the loss. This is giving up the point on which the whole of his argument rests—viz. the assumptions that the consequences of every act are infinite in duration. The *opinion* that a man may "so maim the faculties of his soul as to unfit him forever to resist evil or to love or serve God," is altogether gratuitous. The passage quoted from Heb. vi has reference only to men in the flesh. The Bible declares, that every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father, Phil. ii, 10, 11. As to "the finally impenitent and incorrigible," I desire to repeat, that the pages of inspiration know of no such charac-

ters. It is obvious that, as man is a finite being, the sphere and influence of *all* his actions must be circumscribed.

56. If man cannot commit an infinite sin, can he deserve endless punishment?

A. But man may commit such a sin. In addition to what we have said on the subject, we add—1. Man's sins may be infinite in their effects on himself as we have already shown.—

2. They may be infinite in their affects on others, through bad example or doctrine which may be transmitted thro' time and affect eternity, as the works of Voltaire, Thomas Paine, and be not offended if I add, other writings.—

3. Man's sin is against an infinite law, a law whose claims on us can *never be relinquished*.—It is our duty to love God with all our powers, whether in heaven, earth or hell. If we have lost our power to do so, this does not exonerate us; we should not have lost it. Suppose you loaned a person a thousand dollars yesterday, and last evening he should have lost it and all he was worth at a gambling table, would his inability to-day, clear him of the debt?

Rej. 1. It has not been shown that "man's sins may be infinite in their effects on himself." 2. If man's *evil* actions can be infinite in their consequences, his *good* actions can *also* be infinite in their effects. In this light, a man may, at one period of his life, perform *virtues* infinite in their consequences and at another be guilty of *evils* co-extensive in their effects. Of course he will be infinitely virtuous and infinitely vicious! 3. Man does not sin against an infinite law, nor can he be amenable to a law above his comprehension. It is our duty to love God with all our soul, mind and strength, simply because he loves us with all *his* mind might and strength. If he ever withdraws his love from us, we should be under no obligation to love him. If you should loan a person a sum of money, *knowing* at the time, or having good reason to *expect*, that he would lose it all at a gambling table the same evening, you could not justly complain of his subsequent inability to discharge the debt. There is not a plainer principle in morals, than this: "the expected result of a perfectly deliberate and voluntary act, determines the character of the motive by which it was prompted."

57. If one sin be infinite, can a million be any more.

58. If one sin be *not* infinite, can a million sins amount to an infinite sin?

A. The infinitude which we attach to sin consists only in its duration. In this respect a million cannot be longer than one, but certainly sin may vary in number and magnitude.—Here is a straight line which runs on forever, a million could not add to its length, but may there not be a million parallel ones, of different magnitudes by the side of it?

Rej. Every man performs many vicious and also many virtuous deeds. The record against every man must therefore present perhaps a million sins and a million virtuous deeds. The first line a sin, the second a virtue, and so on to the end of the chapter! And each is to be infinite in its consequences! So that endless happiness and endless misery must be the portion of every individual of mankind!

59. If sin be infinite, can one sin be greater than another?

A. Yes, in magnitude, according to the light and circumstances under which it was committed.

60. If sin be infinite, can it be true that "where sin abounded, grace did *much more* abound?" Rom. v, 20.

A. In this verse and the proceeding, the Apostle was running a parallel between the sinful act of Adam and the righteous atoning one

of Christ: In which he showed that the latter exceeded or *abounded* beyond the former, that is, the atoning act of Christ, not only redeemed mankind from that death to which the sinful act of Adam had subjected them, but in addition, had given them many other blessings, not immediately connected with that restoration, and would finally bring the believing and obedient to nearer relation to God, than they would have enjoyed, if Adam had even remained innocent. This is the Apostle's argument. The text has no reference to the infinite consequences of sin at all, but simply to the surplus or additional blessings which the death of Christ brought to the human family, beyond what they lost in Adam.

Rej. Even allowing (what is by no means admitted) that our correspondent is correct in the mass of his Answer to the Question, what is the conclusion? The sin of Adam could have been *in no sense* infinite, inasmuch as "where sin abounded grace did *much more* abound." That which is *in any sense*, infinite, cannot be circumscribed. The Apostle, in my judgment, was enforcing the glorious truth, that the grace of God is mightier in its influences than all the sins of which men may be guilty—and that, in his own good time, he will bring light out of darkness and good out of evil. But if sin be in any sense infinite, its consequences must place man beyond the reach of even the strong arm of redeeming love.

COVENANTS.

Much is said, particularly in the epistles of the New Testament respecting the two covenants. It may not be unprofitable, therefore, to inquire into the meaning of the term, and to point out the relative difference and advantages of these covenants. Unless we do, much of the beauty and force of the Holy Scriptures are lost to us.

A covenant is a compact or treaty made for some specific object. There must be, at least, two parties. Both may have a part to perform, or one may have the whole work to execute.—In the prosecution of an agreement, one party may become dissatisfied and unreconciled and a Mediator may then be necessary, or both parties may dislike the covenant and desire its dissolution. In the covenant God has made with man, it is generally supposed that there is unreconciliation on the part of the Supreme Being; that Christ came to appease the divine wrath. But not so. 'God is in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.' 'God commendeth his love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.' Man is wrong. God is right. Man has rebelled, and Jesus has come to restore him to purity and holiness. In the final covenant made with the world, Jehovah has assigned to himself the whole work.—True, man is to believe and repent, but these are good and perfect gifts from his Creator. It is but half the work to make a heaven. The other half is to prepare man for the enjoyment of it. Both must be affected by a God. For instance, it was only a part of the grand scheme to make this world. The remainder of the work was to bring man into being and to suit him to the circumstances in which he was to be placed. To use strong language, God will not let man save himself. To him belongs the glory of creation and preservation, and he will have the glory of redemption. If man could save himself he might then sing paens of praise to himself, but he could not, consistently, to his God. I would as soon ascribe to myself my creation and continuance in being, as to ascribe to my efforts, my final salvation. I want my God should have the praise of redeeming the universe.

The following parallel may show, in some

slight degree, the difference between the Old Covenant and the New.

OLD COVENANT.	NEW COVENANT.
1. National.	1. Universal.
2. Conditional.	2. Unconditional.
3. God appears as a Law-giver.	3. As a Father.
4. Future state indistinctly known.	4. Revealed.
5. Temporary.	5. Everlasting.
6. Laws written on stone.	6. Written on the heart.

Christian Intelligencer.

THE DILEMMA.

In No. 19, of the present volume, we published an article, originally from the Episcopal Recorder, giving an account of a Universalist clergyman who took for his text, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." A Lutheran clergyman present, greatly feared the effect of the Universalist sermon on the members of his church, many of whom were in attendance. When, therefore, the speaker was through, he arose and desired him to read the conclusion of the verse from which his text was taken. The poor Universalist was confounded, but "common civility" demanded a compliance, and with evident reluctance he at length read, "He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved and he that believeth not shall be damned." The Lutheran made an appropriate remark, and "the effect was overwhelming." At least so says the account. A very different statement of the affair, however, appears in No. 19, with the article.

Br. Whittemore, of the Trumpet, in commenting on this story of the Lutheran clergyman, relates one of the celebrated Dr. Beecher, which we think will answer as a very good offset to the one of the Lutheran brother. It follows.

P.

We recollect (says Br. W.) that Dr. Beecher once attempted to read two verses in connexion in the 16th of Matthew, and was obliged to *back out*. See verses 27 and 28. "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." It was the design of the Doctor to prove that this rewarding men according to their works, was to take place in the future state of existence; but in such a case he must read only one of the verses, viz. the 27th; for the 28th confines the judgment to the age in which the Savior lived, and to the life time of some of those to whom he was then speaking. But the Doctor did not know this when he commenced to read the verses, and he was therefore thrown into a very disagreeable situation.

He went on as follows: (with much solemnity and power of voice,) "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily, I say unto you, there be some"—hem! hem! and another evangelist says, "whosoever denies me, I will deny him." This was the celebrated Lyman Beecher, D. D., now president of Lane Seminary in Ohio; and it transpired a few years since in the Baptist meeting house in Cambridgeport. How can this be made to appear *honest*? The Doctor endeavored to hide from his hearers, what he undoubtedly saw was the true sense of the words of Christ. We know that these events actually transpired, and that this relation is literally true.

Original.

UNITARIAN LIBERALITY.

Unitarians claim to be *Liberal Christians*.—And in some respects the claim is just. They have labored successfully in exposing the absurdities of the doctrines of original sin, total depravity, imputed righteousness, the Trinity, etc.; and in doing this, they have removed so many

fruitful sources of contention, and have done much towards reconciling the differences which unfortunately exist among professors of the same heavenly religion. They have, in many instances, evinced a perfect willingness that all the opponent sects in Christendom shall be allowed to enjoy and express their peculiar sentiments without molestation; and that no man shall be slandered or considered dangerous to the community, merely for an honest difference of opinion on speculative points of theology.—This is all well enough. And this I had long supposed was the general character of our Unitarian brethren. Recently, however, I have been compelled to think differently of them.

In "The Unitarian Miscellany and Christian Monitor," Vol. II p. 27, we read; "The following extract is from the Christian Disciple, a work conducted by a number of Clergymen in Boston and its vicinity, and may be supposed to convey the prevailing sentiment of the Unitarians in this country. 'We cannot but wonder and lament, that any should so far pervert the oracles of God, as to persuade men to believe, that there is no punishment hereafter, an error, we repeat, most dangerous to the interests of society; it breaks down the barriers of conscience, and removes those salutary restraints, without which neither virtue nor reputation, nor property are secure.'"

Now I can solemnly assure our Unitarian brethren, that "we cannot but wonder and lament, that any should so far" depart from the Spirit of Christ, as to substitute for argument mere "railing accusations."

The above "extract" evinces a sad lack of Christian charity, and breathes the spirit of rancor. Do they not know that there are many professing Christians who do not believe in punishment in the immortal state? Yes. Do they then mean to intimate that all such have "the barriers of conscience broken down," all "salutary restraints removed from them," that they destroy both "virtue and reputation," and that "property" is not "secure" where they are? This appears to be their meaning. For they plainly declare that, "without (the belief in future punishment,) neither virtue, nor reputation, nor property, are secure."

To say that you believe a man's theological sentiments to be altogether incompatible with the Scriptures, and even calculated to exert a demoralizing influence, is quite consistent with Christian liberality. But to declare that if a man does not believe this, that, or the other, doctrinal tenet, "neither virtue, nor reputation, nor property," can be "secure" where he is, is manifestly uncharitable and unjust.

We do "wonder and lament" that we should receive such unkind treatment from such a source. If it had emanated from the late "Christian Soldier," or even from the N. Y. "Christian Intelligencer," we could have borne it with less "wonder and lamentation." But to be thus "wounded in the house of our (supposed) friends"—Oh! who can bear it! A. M.

Reading Pa.

* Christ. Dis. No 70 for March & April. 1819.

■ Particular Notice. ■

The patrons of the "Herald and Watchman" will bear in mind that they must advise us immediately, if they wish the Messenger continued to them. See last No.

Original

DOCTRINES.—NO. 6.

They that murmur shall learn doctrine.

Isa. xxix, 24.

That the doctrine of the Atonement, as generally understood by Christians, contradicts the Bible, will evidently appear from the five following particulars:

1. It represents the Deity as suffering punishment, pain, and death. Dr. Watts says, "The Great Jehovah dies," and "Justice was pleased to bruise the God."

"Well might the sun in darkness hide,
And shut his glories in,
When God the Mighty Maker died,
For man the creature's sin."

And we read in Dwight's collection,

"He, that distributes crowns and thrones,
Hangs on a tree and bleeds and groans;
The Prince of Life resigns his breath;
The King of Glory bows to death."

I shall so far deviate from the assertion advanced by a late controversialist, "poetry proves nothing," as to say that the sentiments contained in the above, present one of the cardinal features of the doctrine in question. It is contended that as "the fall" plunged all mankind into everlasting wretchedness, exposing them to the infinite avenging wrath of the Almighty, so an "infinite Atonement," or satisfaction, must be made in order that some might escape; hence we are told "the Divine nature suffered," "God the Mighty Maker died," &c.

Job, addressing his Maker, says, "Hast thou eyes of flesh; or see'st thou as man seeth; are thy days as the days of a man; and thy years as man's days?" Job. x, 4, 5, and David declares "O my God, thy years are throughout all generations; thou art the same and thy years shall have no end," Ps. cii, 24—27. "And thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands, they shall perish but thou remainest; but thou art the same and thy years shall not fail," Heb. i, 12. Yet in the face of this testimony, (and much more might be produced,) the doctrine of the Atonement supposes that the ever-living, eternal, and unchangeable God ended His days on Mount Calvary. "The King of Glory bows to death."

The notion that God suffered punishment and pain which this doctrine involves, is unscriptural as well as unphilosophical. We are told "The terrors of soul, the consternation and inward agonies which our blessed Lord sustained were sufficient proof that he endured punishments which were due to sin." I need not refer the reader to the almost numberless passages of scripture which go to prove that the Almighty is perfectly holy, happy, wise, just and good; how such a Being can be said, to have suffered punishment, pains, and death I leave for others to explain. *Punishment* supposes pre-existing evil in the subjects punished, and pain belongs exclusively to dependent, and created beings; then neither of them can be endured by the immaculate and uncreated Eternal.

2d. This doctrine of the Atonement denies the Bible, by declaring that Jesus Christ was the object of his Father's wrath. At the baptism of Jesus there was a voice from heaven saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," Mat. iii, 17. "Behold my servant whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased," xii, 18. See parallel passages, Mark i, Luke iii, and 2 Pet. i, 17. "The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into his hand," John iii, 35, and v, 20. "Behold my servant whom I uphold; mine elect in whom my soul delighteth," Isa. xlvi, i, &c. Now if Jehovah 'loves the Son,' if He is 'well-pleased,' with Him, if 'His soul delighteth in him,' if He has 'given him power over all flesh,' and the 'heathen and the uttermost parts of the earth for his inheritance,' can it be true that the avenging wrath and fury of Omnipotence were poured out upon him, that he sustained in his own person that eternal weight of sin and guilt which would have kindled the immortal fires of hell for every son and daughter of Adam?

3d. A third item in which this doctrine opposes the Bible is this: It represents God as punishing the *innocent*, instead of the guilty, "I (the Lord) will punish the world for their evil and the wicked for their iniquity," Isa. xiii, 11.—The Lord is slow to anger and great in power and *will not at all acquit* the wicked," Nahum i, 3. "For thou Lord will bless the righteous; with favor wilt thou compass him as with a shield," Ps. v, 12.

I need not multiply passages to show that peace, joy and happiness are the constant attendants of righteousness and well doing, while tribulation and sorrow pursue the workers of iniquity. Jesus Christ was righteous, undefiled and separate from sinners: how could he be deserving of, or suffer, those pains and punishments which are the lot of transgressors? What justice was there in transfixing his sacred person with those penal darts which are reserved only for them who 'obey not the truth,' and love the wages of unrighteousness? Alas! what hope of reward, or joy, can good men indulge, polluted as they are by 'in-dwelling sin' and imperfections, if the Almighty arose in the majesty of His fierce vengeance against His own 'beloved son,' who 'knew no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth?'

4th. The doctrine we are considering denies the Bible by teaching that God must be reconciled to man, instead of man's being reconciled to God. 'For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of His son; much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life,' Rom. v, 10. 'And all things are of God who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation,' 2 Cor. v, 18. 'And you that were sometimes alienated & enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled,' Col. i, 21.

Nothing can be plainer than the fact that men have become alienated from God by wicked works; they need to be *reconciled* to His will and government; they require to be purged from the lusts of the flesh and the vanities of the world, and to become the obedient servants of the living God. To effect this benevolent object Jesus came; for this, the light of the gospel beamed upon the world; with a prospect so replete with glory and felicity before them, the angels attuned their harps, 'the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy.' In anticipation of that happy period when all the kingdoms, tongues, and nations of the earth shall be reconciled to God the Father, did our blessed Savior proclaim the tidings of 'peace on earth and good will to men.' He bore witness to the truth that 'God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself,' and sealed with his blood the testimony to that heavenly love and grace which shall break in pieces the despoiler, subdue the rebellious, make an end of sin, sway the sceptre of righteousness over a ransomed universe.

But the Atonement as it is generally understood implies that the Almighty is alienated from his creatures; that the death of Christ was to appease his avenging wrath, and stop the hand of offended Heaven already upraised to dash His own children in pieces.

5th. This doctrine contradicts the voice of inspiration, as it represents Christ absolving the sinner from merited punishment. "The Hebrew word, (says Buck,) signifies covering, and intimates that our offences are, by a proper atonement *covered* from the avenging justice of God." But what say the scriptures of truth? "There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob; for this is my covenant unto them when I shall take away their sins," Rom. xi, 26, 27. A Deliverer from what? not from "avenging justice" surely, but from *ungodliness and sin*.—"Now once in the end of the world hath he (Christ) appeared to put away sin," Heb. ix,

26; not to put away God's justice or his wrath, but to present to men a glorious system of truth that shall teach them "the fear of the Lord, which is the beginning of wisdom." "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world," John i, 29; not that taketh away punishment or Almighty wrath. "Unto you first, God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Acts iii, 26.—Hence it is manifest that Christ is a Savior, a Deliverer, the Elect and Chosen of the Father, to "save his people from their sins."

If by "the avenging justice of God" is meant His determination to punish the sinner, we affirm that the death of Christ did not "cover" him from such a punishment; for the volume of truth plainly declares, "God will by no means clear the guilty." "He is a just God and a Savior." "He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong done." "Doth the Almighty pervert justice?" &c. The wicked shall be punished for his evil deeds, there is no peace to the wicked, there is no escape, "for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." But while "judgment is laid to the line and righteousness to the plummet," God commendeth His love to us in sending His dear Son to die, not in order to display Almighty "avenging justice," or to screen us from merited punishment; not to read in sun-dier the innocent Jesus as a substituted sacrifice to insulted Heaven; "not to condemn—but to save the world." In the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ we do not behold an immolated victim whose blood,

"Was sprinkled o'er the burning throne
And turned the wrath to grace,"

but the revelation of a Father's good will and mercy unveiling a pathway to the fields of the blessed; a display of unspeakable love, which "in the fulness of times" the spirits of all men shall celebrate in the heavenly Paradise of God.

B. B. H.

[FOR THE MESSENGER AND UNIVERSALIST.]
THE MISCELLANY—No. 2.

Duty of love to God.

The following excellent remarks are extracted from Sermon I. contained in Porter's Lectures on Homiletics, &c. The text is Matt. xxi, 37, 38. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart," &c. After having spoken of the properties of this love, and shown that it is *supreme, impartial, diffusive, or active, and permanent*, the learned author says, "I proceed,

II. To show that it is the DUTY OF ALL MEN TO POSSESS THIS LOVE.

My first argument must of course be derived from the character of God, and the relations he sustains to us. His moral attributes, comprised in the general term *goodness*, are the basis of all moral obligation. This I have assumed in the remarks already made, and must assume in what is to follow. This doctrine is so necessarily presupposed in the moral affections which the law requires, that without it, these requisitions must be *nugatory*. For if God is not *lovely*, whatever powers men possess, and to whatever other things the authority of God might bind them, it could never bind them to *love* himself. To tremble at his majesty, and to dread his displeasure, might indeed be reasonable; but to *love* his character, if it were divested of all moral excellency, could never be a duty, for it would be wrong. But *God himself is love*. In him are united all those perfections which render him the object of supreme love to us. And this argument is greatly strengthened when we consider his relations to us.

He is our *Creator*. Besides a body "fearfully and wonderfully made," he has given us a soul surpassing in value all his other works, and stamped with a brighter resemblance of his own

intelligence and immortality. Augustine says; "If a Sculptor, after fashioning a piece of marble into a human figure, could inspire it with life and sense, could give it motion, and understanding, and speech, its first act doubtless would be to prostrate itself at the feet of its maker in subjection and thankfulness." And shall man refuse his homage, to the God that made him? The sun was formed to shine, and it shines. The beasts were made to serve man, and they bow their necks, in cheerful submission to his will. And shall man, who was formed for the special purpose of glorifying God, stand alone in this wide world, and refuse to fulfil the end of his creation?

God is our *preserver* and *benefactor*. Blessings surpassing all computation in number and value he bestows on us, while he has shaped the whole system of his beneficence so, that he is *himself* the only absolute good to the soul. The appetite of hunger is not satisfied with the fragrance of the rose,—it demands *food*. The eye is not satisfied with the enchantments of music,—its element is *light*. The ear is not satisfied with the beauties of the rainbow,—its element is *harmony*. So the love of God, is the proper element of the soul. And who is in fact, the happy man in this world? Not he who makes a god of this world; not he who expects happiness from any of its enjoyments, but he who lifts his eye above them all in the fervent aspiration, "Whom have I in heaven but thee?—and there is none upon earth, that I desire besides thee."

But the consummation of all other blessings, which claim our love to God, is the gift of his Son. If we are "fearfully and wonderfully made," we are still more fearfully and wonderfully redeemed. Can any human heart fail to see, in the wonders of the cross, a demonstration of its duty to love God?

My second argument is drawn from the *capacities of men*, as moral agents. Let common sense be made the expositor of my text. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart." Though God is worthy of perfect love, a tree or a stone is not bound by this command. *It has no heart*;—it is not a moral agent. But should it be said, I have indeed understanding, affections, and will; I can love an object that is present to my senses, and that is agreeable to my feelings; but for a sinful and limited being like me, to love an infinite spirit,—to love a *holy God, perfectly*, is as much impossible, as if I had no heart; again I say, let common sense and conscience speak. You love your *friend* after he is laid in the grave. Was it then a portion of organized dust, or an intelligent, immortal *mind*, that was thus dear to your heart? And if you can love the *spirit* of your friend,—that part of him which loved you,—why not love the *Father of spirits*? And what if God is an infinite, and you are a limited being? He requires you to love him, not with an *infinite* love, not with the love of Gabriel, but according to the measure of *your* capacities, or with all *your* heart. And what if that heart is *sinful*? Does this exempt it from obligation to be *holy*? When you say I cannot love God with this *sinful* heart, you offer as an excuse, the very thing which constitutes your guilt: an excuse which is never offered in any other human concern. Should a disobedient son, say of a good father, "I cannot love him; I should rejoice to obey his commands, but can find no satisfaction in it," who would give the weight of a feather to such an apology? Can you then say, and think yourself sincere and innocent in saying, "I desire with all my heart to love God, but yet my heart refuses to love him?" What is this but absurdity and mockery! Are you a moral agent? Then conscience decides that you have no want of capacities to obey the first and great commandment of the law."

MESSENGER & UNIVERSALIST.

SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1834.

Thanksgiving Discourses.

The subjects of discourse in both the Orchard-st, and Greenwich Churches to-morrow evening, will be the unparalleled prosperity of our cause for the year or two past, and more especially its success in this city. Services to commence at half past 7 o'clock precisely.

RAYNER'S LECTURES.

PARABLE OF THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS; illustrated in Nine Lectures, delivered in the First Universalist Church in Portland, Me. by MENZIES RAYNER, Pastor of said Church. Boston: published by Marsh, Capen and Lyon, 1833.

This is probably the most extended examination of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus which has ever been given to the public. Indeed we fear that its length will be considered by many as an objection to the work. The author makes no pretension to much that is "entirely new, and which others had never thought of." But he has in an easy and interesting style embodied almost every thing that is worthy of remark in relation to his subject. He has taken up and refuted one after another, every point upon which reliance is placed in this proof-text of endless misery. And surely he deserves the thanks of every christian for so forcibly calling back the public mind from the fictions of imagination which it has long indulged on this subject, to the simple but unerring word of inspiration. The author does not allow, on the one hand, that the Rich Man was a monster of vice, nor on the other that Lazarus was a pattern of virtue and piety. He does not allow it for the plain, and to the christian the sufficient reason, that our divine Master has not affirmed, nor in the most distant manner intimated it. Indeed our Lord has said nothing of the moral character either of the Rich Man or Lazarus. Of the former we are told that he was rich, clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day—of the latter, that he was a beggar, full of sores, laid at the Rich Man's gate, faint to be fed with the crumbs that fell from his table. Even in hades, where the Rich Man implores mercy from father Abraham, he is accused with not one solitary crime—nor answered with one reproachful word. "Son," said the Patriarch, "remember that thou in thy life time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted and thou art tormented." How similar this suggestion to that excited in the mind of the patient Job—"What shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?"

Mr. Rayner is not the first who has observed and reprehended the prevailing custom of making void the words of Christ by "tradition"—by the fictions of religionists who hope to support their theory by additions to the inspired volume. Dr. Campbell says, "Much injury has been done to the Savior's instructions, by the ill-judged endeavors of some expositors to improve and strengthen them. I know of no better example for illustrating this remark than the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Many dissatisfied with its simplicity, as related by the Evangelist, and desirous, one would think, to vindicate the character of the Judge from the charge of excessive severity, in the condemnation of the former, load that wretched man with all the crimes which can blacken human nature, and for which they have no authority from the words of inspiration. They will have him to have been a glutton and a drunkard, rapacious and unjust, cruel and hard hearted, one who spent in intemperance what he had acquired by fraud." Such is the language of Dr. Campbell. One needs but read the parable, to be convinced of its truth. They who give such representations of the Rich Man do it on their own authority; the words of inspiration gives them no sanction whatever. Their desire "to vindicate the character of the Judge from the charge of excessive severity" to which the Dr. alludes is certainly praise-worthy; but we would suggest whether it is not founded in the nature of the revolving doctrine which the parable is adduced to support, and indeed inseparable from it. For ourselves we believe most firmly, that the doctrine of endless misery can never be asserted, and at the same time leave the character of God capable of vindication. It is at eternal war with every attribute of the Deity. You may load the Rich Man not only "with every crime that can blacken human nature," but with all the crimes that human nature has ever committed, since the origin of our race, and still his guilt bears no proportion to the punishment you suppose him doomed to en-

dure. No: would you vindicate the character of God, expunge from your creed a doctrine which sets all vindication at defiance, and which at best represents the Deity as a capricious tyrant, or as a being of almost unmixed cruelty.

In showing the popular Limitarian view of the parable to be incorrect and altogether untenable, we think our author has succeeded to the satisfaction of every candid mind.—Whatever the true interpretation may be, it is certain that the popular one is *false*. This we feel to be sufficient for the purpose of defending Universalism. It is not necessary in every case for us to show what a passage *does* mean; if we can succeed in proving that it *does not* support the doctrine of endless misery, it is enough.

With the exposition of the parable under consideration most generally adopted by Universalists, and presented in a clear and pleasing form in these Lectures, we have never felt ourselves fully satisfied. We acknowledge it to be plausible, perhaps we should say probable, but it does not bring to our mind that convincing evidence of its truth which is essential to a full and ready assent. There is one point in particular at which we stumble. The Rich Man is said to represent the Jewish nation. We ask then, who are the "five brethren?" Surely they are not the *Jews* also, for according to this exposition, the whole nation is already represented under the character of the Rich Man. Nor can they be the successive generations of that people. We are aware of the important and necessary principle in the interpretation of parables, that the speaker has generally but one object in view—but one doctrine or fact to illustrate—and that all the little appendages which are essential to give beauty or interest to the parable are to be regarded as unimportant, or deserving no consideration in its exposition. But such stress seems to be laid by our Savior on the "five brethren" and the circumstances connected with them that we should not feel it to be satisfactory to pass them by unexplained.

But we are protracting our remarks to too great a length. We are sometimes led to doubt whether any exposition has as yet been offered which deserves full credence. The Limitarian explanation is beset with difficulties and can never be sustained. Whatever the parable may illustrate, therefore, it can never be made to support the doctrine of endless suffering.

We close by commanding the above mentioned Lectures to the attention and careful perusal of both friends and opposers. They contain much that is highly interesting and valuable. Of the author's interpretation of the parable they will be prepared after an attentive reading to judge for themselves. But we feel assured that our friends will rise from their perusal more deeply convinced of God's universal grace, and our opposers, with diminished confidence in the doctrine of ceaseless woe, and more ardent prayers for a world's salvation.

S.

"HOLLEY, ORLEANS Co. N. Y."

Another Revival Story.

In the last N. Y. Evangelist we observe a letter from Rev. R. H. Conklin, under date of "Holley, March 25th, 1834," giving an account of a very astonishing *revival* which has recently taken place there. As a preliminary step, he says the county temperance-agent, F. W. Graves arrived and commenced the work of reform. A few days saw "more than 500 added to the temperance list within the circle of a few miles," and then "the way of Lord seemed pre-eminently prepared for a glorious manifestation of divine power and grace." He then proceeds:

"We immediately commenced preaching every evening. Brother Graves, and brother Griswold of Rochester, came to our assistance.—Meetings were crowded and solemn. The sanctuary was an awful place, 'the house of God and the gate of heaven.' The seats for inquiry were thronged with the aged and the young. The man of gray hairs was heard to say, 'My friends, I have tried Universalism, but it will never answer.' 'Pray for me,' seemed to be the language of every heart. * * * Some who were accustomed to join the midnight revel, and sip from the drunkard's bowl, have bowed in submission at the foot of the cross—drinking at the fountain of life. Others who sat measurably secure under the false coverings of Universalism, have felt that 'justice and judgment are the habitation of God's throne'; and that the 'wicked shall be turned into hell,' and are now looking to Christ for eternal redemption. The moralist has chang-

ed his self-righteous garb, for the adorable robe of Christ's righteousness. In short, sinners of every character have shared liberally in this great and marvelous work of God.

Before our meeting closed in the village, we judged it expedient to draw off a part of our force and commence operations in a little neighborhood three miles from the centre. God's spirit apparently was waiting to bless and make effectual his own truth. Salvation rolled in upon us like a mighty torrent; while God's people seemed to besiege the throne of heaven, so that 'the violent took it by force.' * * * A merchant, a lawyer, and a physician are among the hopeful subjects of grace. Several Universalists also are among the trophies of sovereign and victorious grace."

We are not disposed to deny, unqualifiedly, (ere we receive further information,) the relations of the Rev. Mr. Conklin above. We know not, positively, but there may be "many," and even hundreds, of *professed* "Universalists among the trophies of"—Partialism in Holley. Such a thing *may possibly* be, but at the same time we have just reason to doubt its truth in toto. These statements (generally unfounded,) have become so common—so much a kind of *matter-of-course* expression in all revival accounts, that there is no dependence whatever to be placed upon them.

Other circumstances lead us to apprehend that an undue zeal has given to the Rev. Mr. Conklin's narrative an *extra* coloring. He is a total stranger to us. He may be a man of the soundest veracity, and his statements all true to the letter. But recent communications from our own friends in the same vicinity show a very different aspect. Our cause is regarded as highly prosperous, and the efforts of Revivalists, (in comparison with the means adopted) are looked upon as *a total failure*. Our worthy Br. Townsend, as will be seen by our last paper, is laboring in that section, and is highly encouraged with his prospects. Another circumstance, and which certainly is far from affording evidence of the rapid decline of Universalism, is, that since the first of this month, we have received from this very place (Holley) *six or seven* subscribers to the Messenger and Universalist. A dozen or more from the immediate neighborhood. Other papers have undoubtedly shared equally with ourselves. Surely this does not argue a very rapid decline of our cause. If the "young and old—the man of gray hairs, have tried Universalism and found that it will not answer," they can have little use for *Universalist papers*!

Will Br. Townsend or some other friend in that section, give us, immediately, the particulars of this "mighty work of the Lord," before which "Universalists, and drunkards, and liars, and thieves," (the usual charitable association by Limitarians,) are represented to have fallen like grass before the mower. If Mr. Conklin's trumpet does not give "an uncertain sound" we certainly would be the last to question its report.

P.

VALUE OF ONE SMALL PAMPHLET.

It may be of interest to some of our readers, in the city of New-York particularly, to be informed that in the case of conversion noticed in our last, the lady's attention was first directed to a serious examination of our doctrine, by a perusal of the little pamphlet issued from this office, containing the "Statement of Facts," by Br. Sawyer, in relation to the conduct of Dr. Brownlee and the Editors of the Christian Intelligence, in their attack on Universalism, and which conduct they had neither the ~~bold~~ courage, or magnanimity, to allow to be respectfully canvassed in their own columns.

The husband had carried one of the pamphlets into the house. It lay about for a week or two, looked upon by the lady as a very bad thing indeed, and respected only for her husband's sake. From some trifling circumstance she one day opened it. Becoming interested, she read it through, and was forcibly struck with the peculiar situation in which the individuals, of whom it spoke, were placed. She read it still again, and the spirit which appeared to breath through it, and the circumstances it detailed, all seemed to impress it upon her mind that the Universalists could not be *quite* so bad as they had ever been held up to her, and as she had ever really believed them to be. She resolved to look farther. The Appeal to the Public, on the 213 Questions, came next in her way. She read that. After this she ventured to look into the Messenger, and finally to go to church with her husband, carefully comparing all, (from the

first moment of her new interest,) with the scriptures to see whether they "spoke according to the testimony."—The result is, that in a few weeks, (of intense interest and examination, it is true,) she has been wholly emancipated from the bondage of Partialism, and is rejoicing in the freedom of the Gospel of Christ.

This, however, is only a single case. Similar ones are now presenting themselves in almost incredible numbers, and they should afford ourselves and our friends strong encouragement in every effort to produce correct views of our doctrine in the public mind. We have seen enough to convince us that men need only to be made acquainted with our religion, in its true character, to respect and cherish it, and to participate at once in its deep and lasting joys and consolations. Shall we then hesitate at all in our exertions to impart its joy-inspiring influences to others?

Opposers intrude themselves and their measures every where. The most sacred retirement of the domestic circle—our stores—our workshops, are not exempt. We are inundated with their *exhortations* and their *tracts*. Now we would not wish a corresponding course from our friends—we should despise it, and feel that they had sacrificed the dignity of christianity in descending to it, but we do wish them to be prepared to meet every assault, from their opposers, as become *men and christian freemen*. Let them store the mind in such manner as to have ready utterance on all proper occasions, and furnish themselves with pamphlets or papers, that they may always be ready for an *exchange* when opposing views are urged upon them; and let them insist upon a *perusal* of theirs too. Our people have altogether the advantage here. We are not *afraid* to read.—We court investigation, and in regard to our own views with opposers, the seed which many times may be cast upon a barren, sterile soil, as we suppose it to be, will take deep root when we least expect it, and flourish beyond our most sanguine expectations. In the case in question, our sister had been an active member of a partialist church for many years, and all this time a determined opposer of Universalism. In this opposition she was sincere. She had readily confided in all the popular representations of the sentiment, and honestly believed it to combine all that was opposed to good order, religion and morality. But the very moment her attention was seriously arrested, and she began to examine for herself, the veil was removed, and we have no doubt that she has already realized an hundred fold product of joy. And this has all been accomplished by the most simple (visible) means. The entire aspect of things over one domestic circle has been suddenly and happily changed.—Where were existing, for a long time, divisions in religious views, all is now harmony, peace, and love. Where for years had reigned, in the mind of one, the most poignant apprehensions for the future well being of dear friends, now triumph hopes as expansive as creation, and as boundless as eternity. Shall we then distrust the favorable issue of our labors and exertions, because we may not see instantaneous fruits therefrom? No, by no means. He who has never yet failed to give us "rains and fruitful seasons," will not fail to gladden our hearts with the fruits of our labors in his moral heritage. And in this we may rest, confident that "our labor will not be in vain in the Lord."

Let us then one and all firmly resolve within ourselves to be faithful to our trust. As friends of christian liberty, and the good order of society—as well-wishers to our fellow men, we have a duty to perform. Let us calmly and considerately, yet decidedly, stand forth in faithfully discharging it. Let us carefully improve every opportunity in which our opposers will hear, or read, and by which they will be enabled to arrive at more correct views of our sentiments, than popular prejudice will generally allow, and we may rest satisfied that we shall sooner or later see the dark cloud of bigotry and superstition, which has long hovered over the christian world, casting a sombre hue upon all that should be bright and cheering, rapidly receding before the effulgent rays of the Sun of Righteousness.

P.

THE BRUNSWICK DISCUSSION.

We have just arisen from a *perusal* of the Report of a Discussion held at Brunswick, Rensselaer Co., N. Y. on the evening of Jan. 19th, 1834, between the Rev. J. P. KENDALL, of that place, and Br. C. F. LE FEVRE, now pastor of the Greenwich Society in this city. It is a pamphlet of 16 octavo and closely printed pages, containing a brief account of the circumstances which led to the discussion, together with a Letter to Mr. Kendall by H. J. Grew, editor of the *Gospel Anchor*.

Br. Le Fevre opened the discussion by laying before his auditors, in a very clear and happy manner, a summary of the Universalist faith, with some of the leading arguments in favor of its truth. Mr. Kendall in his introductory remarks expressed himself very happy at this opportunity of meeting Mr. Le Fevre under such circumstances, and said,

"I feel that I should rejoice if God in his providence should make it my duty to follow certain individuals, [Universalist ministers, probably,] from place to place to defend his truth." We very much regret that those better able to defend the Limitarian faith, should not possess equal courage. He denied that punishment is always designed for the good of the punished. "We all know," said he, "that civil rulers do not punish for the good of the individual, but for the good of the community. So it is with God. The highest good of the Universe is at stake, and he does not stop to think about the good of the individual." To the arguments and explanations of Br. Le Fevre, he frequently replied, a *Sunday School scholar would know better than that, or could answer that, &c.* He believed them "the honestest people we have." This is hardly to be doubted, but Mr. Kendall, we suppose, would be offended if we should intimate that the *Sunday School children* were much more honest than their teachers. He was very lavish with the epithet "infidel," and affirmed that "Universalists do deserve Hell, and God will provide it. Their arguments are forgeries upon the Bible." He compared Br. Le Fevre to the Devil, and said that "Universalism is all unbelief." Perhaps these remarks are not his best arguments, but we believe them, with a prejudiced auditory, quite as effective as any he offered.

It is hardly necessary to add that the discussion has been the means of doing much good in the neighborhood where it took place. So true is it that "the wrath of man shall praise God." He will over-rule the enmity of his creatures to his glorious truth so as to make it subservient to its interests and advancement.

Our Limitarian friends begin to see, and they will ere long understand it still better, that silence and affected contempt of Universalism, will neither stay its progress, nor sustain the doctrine of endless misery. The only alternative is open and manly controversy. And this is a field where as yet they have never won, but uniformly lost, glory. Truth is mighty and it will prevail.

S.

A CHALLENGE.

The last Magazine and Advocate contains a letter from Br. Orrin Roberts, giving some account of a Rev. Mr. Way, a Methodist clergyman of Litchfield, N. Y. In the early stages of Universalism in this country, according to this Mr. Way, our opposers considered our doctrine so "palpably erroneous" that it "would die of itself." But now that we have become so numerous, and "are so rapidly multiplying," and it is withal "an error of such vast magnitude," they have "resolved to arise in a body, with an increased zeal and determination to crush the monster." We deem it rather a pity, by-the-by, that the Advocate and Journal—that "great tube" to their denomination, as Br. Leavitt of the Evangelist once rather facetiously termed it—does not lead the way in this "holy war" of extermination.

Br. Roberts states that Mr. Way made an attack on Universalism at a meeting in Cedarville on the 2d of Feb. to which he replied on the evening of the 20th of Feb. After the close he gave Mr. W. an opportunity to reply, and they continued speaking, alternately, till half past twelve.

Mr. Way, at his meeting on the 2d Feb. gave out a challenge for a public controversy. He wanted the Universalists to produce one of their "three *smartest* men," and he would get one to meet him, or do it himself. The concluding paragraph of Br. Roberts' letter, with the accompanying one from Br. S. R. Smith, show the present state of the challenge, and are as follows:

About four weeks ago, he [Mr. Way.] received a letter from Rev. Luther Lee, in which Mr. Lee stated that he would engage with Br. Stephen R. Smith, in a public oral discussion, upon certain conditions, which were stated.—A copy of this letter I obtained of Mr. Way, and sent to Br. Smith, in answer to which I received the letter below. I send it to you for publication, because reports have gone abroad that neither Br. Smith, nor any other Universalist, dare meet Luther Lee in a public oral discussion.

O. ROBERTS.

Clinton, March 5, 1834.
Br. ROBERTS—The reception of the list of

propositions—made as is supposed by Mr. Luther Lee—proposing the public oral discussion of the great question, "Will all men be finally holy and happy?" with either Br. P. Morse, D. Skinner, or myself, is hereby acknowledged. For myself, I answer:—

As Mr. Lee is now engaged in a written controversy on the same general question with Br. Morse, I should deem it uncourteous to interfere with his time, or attention to the subject; and therefore decline discussing that or any similar question with Mr. Lee, until he gives undoubted assurance that the controversy with Mr. Morse is finally closed.

Another reason for declining a public discussion with Mr. Lee now, is, that I cannot repress the belief that the proposal is intended to cover a retreat from the controversy in which he is now engaged—or, at least, to spread abroad the impression that he was able to grapple with several common men at the same time. I am the more induced to believe this, from the fact, that the Methodists cannot suppose him to be the only man among them, who is capable of defending their doctrine. Why, then, is he particularly selected? And why did the challenge originate in Litchfield, with Mr. Way—a young man and almost unknown in that denomination? Why, also, is Mr. Way the only person with whom it is ascertained that Mr. Lee has corresponded on the subject?

But if M. Lee should not be satisfied with the result of the controversy in which he is now engaged, I pledge myself to accept his challenge; and at any convenient time, after he has closed his engagements with Mr. Morse, to discuss with him the following joint question, viz: "Do the Scriptures teach that some men will be endlessly miserable—or that all men will become reconciled to God, and be finally holy and happy?" if he will consent to the following regulations.

1. That the discussion take place at Utica or Clinton, for the greater convenience of the parties, and for the purpose of securing the use of a commodious house.

2. That the Moderators to be chosen as proposed, be educated men, and consequently capable of deciding questions of criticism. And that, if possible, they be laymen.

3. That nothing be admitted as proof of any doctrine except the testimony of the Bible, construed according to acknowledged rules of interpretation.

4. That the Editors of the Methodist paper, viz. the Christian Advocate and Journal, published in the city of New-York, give satisfactory pledges that they will publish in said paper, the whole of the report of said discussion, as taken by the stenographer whom the friends of the respective parties shall employ—that pledge being reciprocated by the Editors of the Universalist paper called the Christian Messenger, also published in that city.

Yours truly and affectionately,
Rev. O. ROBERTS. S. R. SMITH.

The pledge desired of us in the concluding part of the 4th condition, proposed by Br. Smith, is most cheerfully given. We are always willing to give *both sides* of a pending question, if we give either—we should be very *un-willing* to do otherwise. If we had material objections to one side, or were unwilling to lay it before our readers, we *think* we should reject both. But in the case in question, we do not hesitate to engage, that if Br. Smith's conditions are complied with, "the whole discussion," as taken by mutual arrangement between the parties, shall appear in the Messenger and Universalist.

P.

W. We thank Br. Drew for the flattering compliment in his last paper, that "the patrons of the 'Herald and Watchman' could not receive a better paper than the one proposed to be sent them." This is saying *much* for our humble sheet—more, we fear, than is *justly* its due. But we doubt not it was

"kindly meant," and we can only feel a renewed wish and desire that the paper may be rendered *worthy* of the compliment. If we can only make it *as good, and as useful, as many others* in the connexion, we shall be content. Our highest ambition has been to render it a successful coadjutor with the faithful laborers already in the field, and we confidently trust there is cause for rejoicing with us all.

At the same time we feel bound to say, that it is not to Br. D. alone, we are under obligations in this respect. We should be ungrateful indeed, did we not cherish feelings of thankfulness to the rest of our editorial brethren who have spoken so decidedly from time to time in favor of our paper, and some of whom have in addition to all this forwarded us many subscribers. Although we have seldom alluded to it, their kindness has been none the less remembered and cherished. P.

Original.

THE TRAITOR'S KISS.

It was well observed by the wise man, that "open rebuke, is better than secret love," and that "faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful." There is no character more contemptible, than that which is marked with treachery. In the open and avowed enemy, we expect opposition, and the mind is consequently prepared to meet the attack. But in the false friend, the arms of our self-defence are taken from us, and we may fall by a blow from that hand, which we should have relied upon as the most ready to protect us. It is not, therefore, without reason, that mankind have with one accord, branded the character of the traitor, with the foulest spot of infamy; and selecting the vilest reptile that crawls the footstool of the earth, as an emblem of his disposition, they have likened him to the viper which stings the bosom that hast warmed him into existence.

How painful is it to the feeling heart, to contemplate this dark feature in the moral character of man! How much more painful is it to be the wretched victim of its treachery! Hence we find David exclaiming, in reference to a blow that even consumed him, "It was not an enemy that reproached me; then I could have borne it; neither was it he that hated me, that did magnify himself against me; for then I would have hid myself from him; but it was thou, a man mine equal, my guide, and mine acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company." Who, that looks upon this picture, and brings home to his own bosom, the cold-hearted treachery of this false friend, can wonder that the Psalmist should exclaim, "Oh that I had wings like a dove! for then, would I fly away and be at rest: lo, then would I wander far off, and remain in the wilderness." The deep solitude of the desert, would be music to that soul, which has been rendered desolate by misplaced friendship.

In perusing the life of him who was so appropriately designated by the Evangelical prophet, "as a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," we scarcely know which to look upon with the greatest astonishment,—the hypocritical manner in which the faithless disciple betrayed his master, or the invincible meekness with which that treachery was received. When Judas had determined to sell the life of his friend, to those who were thirsting for his blood, he agreed upon a sign, by which his master should be recognized by those who came to take him—and this sign was a *kiss*. Cruel and deceitful man! couldst thou select no other sign more congenial with thy dark purpose? or was thy heart so steeled by covetousness, that thou couldst *smile* on the victim, which thou wert leading to the slaughter?

But how was *he* affected who was the subject of this treachery? He stood a perfect pattern of self-command and meekness. Who but that man, who was "tempted in all things, and yet without sin," could have suffered this wrong without upbraiding its unprincipled author? But no reproaches escaped his lips; and while he foresaw his cruel destiny, and cast his pitying eye on the instrument by which he fell, he addressed him in the language of mildness, and said, "friend, wherefore art thou come?" We shall in vain turn over the pages of profane history, to meet with such an example as this. We recognize in it the perfection of all that is holy, pure, and lovely.

We have often thought that, in many favorite doctrines of the church, a character as bad as that of Judas, has been attributed to the God of all mercies, and the Father of the Spirits of all flesh. Do you see that sweet babe, on whose sunny brow, the smile of heaven itself is playing? Do you think, as you gaze on its infant charms, that you see there at least, the cherished object of heaven's pure love? It is all treachery and deceit. Know, fond parent, that this smiling innocent has been cursed in the eternal decrees of God, and while the light of heaven is beaming in its eye, the darkness of hell is treasured up in its heart! It sports its bright day in all the enjoyment of a mother's love, and while God has made such ample provision for it, in the untiring affection of its parents care, He will soon snatch it away from their embrace, and consign it to the dark prison-house of hell, as the company of grim devils and damned spirits. The bright light which he has shed on the path of your earthly pilgrimage, is the "*ignis fatuus*" which has shipwrecked the barque of your happiness on the barren coast of endless despair.

Are you loaded with the bountiful gifts of heaven? Does the earth yield her increase, and the clouds drop down with fatness? Does all nature proclaim the goodness of God? "Tis all delusion! These are the treacherous smiles of a God of inexorable wrath. Fond and trusting fool! The God to whom the warm incense of gratitude is rising from the altar of your heart, is only mocking you. He is "fattening you like the beast for the slaughter." While he surrounds you with these testimonials of his care, he is looking forward to the period when he will not even grant you a drop of water to cool the agonies of that tongue which is *crisp* with the burnings of an undying flame. 'Tis treachery, cruel, false-hearted treachery. He kisses only to betray; and while he is represented as stretching forth his arms, that he may clasp you to his bosom, full well he *knows* that he will pierce your soul with a poisoned dagger, that shall inflict a wound that no art can heal, no balsam assuage.

Friendly reader, we might extend these remarks, but the very picture is revolting. Such conduct in the Deity, is as much more enormous than the treachery of Judas, as infinite attributes are beyond the feeble powers of man. Oh, then, avoid a doctrine which leads to such monstrous results, and trust in Him whose benefits are the testimonials of his love, and whose chastenings are the results of his *mercy*.

C. F. L. F.

Original.

CONVICTION.

Who does not know how many strange things are said and written upon "conviction for sin," "being under conviction," &c. Now, will the reader believe us, when he is told that the word *conviction*, is not in the Bible? But such is the fact.

The word *convicted*, is used once.—"And they which heard it, being *convicted* by their own consciences, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even to the least," John viii, 9.

Read the connexion, and see what the preacher said, which produced this effect. What was the theme of this *converting discourse*? Was any thing said about "the general judgment," "the finally impenitent," and their merciless doom? Just examine the subject, gentle reader, and decide for yourself. This being the only passage in which the word *convicted*, is found, you can well afford to give it a thorough examination.

To *convert* is to *convince*. If one neighbor defrauds another, and is convinced of the atrocity of the deed, he will always be under conviction when he reflects upon it. *Idiots* have no conviction of conscience, because they have no accountableness. Conviction of sin regards each transgression, and has a tendency to restrain and prevent crime, in a degree. But it is by no means certain that people are not under conviction, because they do not forsake their iniquities, for there are different degrees of poignancy to the heart; and to produce reformation, there must be a conviction of the loveliness of truth. Could we see with the eye of God, what a writhing should we witness for sin, even among those who revel under the mask of mirth, or groan beneath the sanctimonious grimaces of religion. Conviction is efficacious only, when it gives proper direction to the mind and the affections. There is nothing in the Scriptures, which, in the least, authorizes the modern proofs of producing conviction, relating experiences, repenting of sins by the gross, and being converted by the job, for life. It is the invention of priesthood, and the hobby of revivals and mystical birth. The doctrine of the Scriptures, is plain and rational. Reader, let us turn from the inventions of men, to the testimony of God.

R. S.

A FUNERAL SERMON

May be expected at the Lombard-st. Universalist Church, Sunday (to morrow) morning. The friends of Mr. Tomlinson are particularly invited to attend.

A. C. T.

PEWS IN ORCHARD-ST. CHURCH.

Persons desiring Pews, or Seats, in this church, can be accommodated by applying to the Sexton, on Sundays, at the church.

Married.

In Philadelphia, on the 27th ult. by the Rev. H. Bibighaus, Mr. VALENTINE SCHWERER, of Boston, Mass., to Miss MARIA FORTNER, eldest daughter of Mr. Ichabod Fortner, of East-Kensington.

Religious Notices.

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach in Trumbull Sunday, 20th (to morrow); at Longridge, Sunday the 27th, and in the School house, near Deansville, the same evening.

Br. Robert Smith will preach at North Salem on Sunday the 27th inst.

Conference.—A conference of Universalists will be held at Branchville, N. J. on the first Saturday and Sunday in May next. Ministering brethren are particularly invited to attend.

GEORGE RODGERS.

Beauties of Arminio-Calvinism.

Just published and for sale at this office, a neat 18 mo. pamphlet of 36 closely printed pages, entitled, "The Beauties of Arminio-Calvinism; or, the story of Deacon Caleb Comfort, to which is added the vision of Deacon Peter Pious." This pamphlet comprises the five articles which have recently appeared in the columns of the Messenger, under the head *Five chapters on Partialism*, and are designed to exhibit the change which has come over the Presbyterian denomination within a few years. Price \$4 per 100, or 6 cents single.

Brunswick Discussion.

Just received at this office, a "Report of the Discussion at Brunswick, June 17, between Rev. J. P. Kendall, and C. F. Le Fevre, to which is added a friendly letter to Rev. J. P. Kendall, by Henry J. Grew." For sale at the *very low price* of six cents, or sixteen pages.

FOR THE MESSENGER AND UNIVERSALIST.

Messrs. Editors—Some years since, when a pupil in the school of the late Rev. SAMUEL WHEPLEY, I selected from his writings the following Poetic Advice, which I believe has never been published, and thinking it too good to be lost to the world, I am induced to solicit for it a place in your paper.

M. T.

New-York, March 28, 1834.

Command thyself, no sudden answer give,
With zeal do good for that alone you live.

To know the worth of time, remember death;
Thy life is short, and passing is thy breath.

Be sober minded, wear a look serene,
Act before God, although by men unseen.

Speak not in vain, nor foolishly depart
From gentle words, and purity of heart.

To truth, and charity, and peace inclin'd,
With caution censure, and condemn mankind.

Seek knowledge far, but shun insipid mirth;
There is no time for folly while on earth.

Feed no ill will, no sudden friendship make,
Betray no trust, no obligations break.

Whatever you neglect, to this attend,
Pity the poor, and be the stranger's friend.

Promise with heed, weigh every action right,
And scan the conduct of each day and night.

Instructed by past failings to be wise,
Let every wish from purest fountain rise.

In talk be scarce, pursue one steady plan,
For action shows the noblest part of man.

Act with relation to a future state;
Retort no slander, render love for hate.

Devotion, friendship, and philosophy,
Shall conquer death, and thou shalt never die.

Death cannot hurt, but grant thee sweet release
From pain and trouble, to eternal peace.

Hast thou read this, O vain inconstant man,
Read it once more, and fault it if you can.

Now calmly lay thine hand upon thy heart,
And say, from this I never will depart.

RESIGNATION.

Religion is the daughter of heaven, the parent of our virtues, and the source of all true felicity.

Resignation, is the sure effect of the diffusion of this holy principle in the soul; and whenever its heavenly influence is felt, it soothes our aching bosoms, brightens the shade of melancholy and destroys every vestige of discontent.

When the hand of providence, is laid heavily upon us, and affliction heaves our bosoms with sorrow, when pale death winds his icy fetters around the forms of our beloved parents, or our most dear and bosom friend, or tears the dear nursling from the watchful and doating mother's fond embrace—how are our joys withered, and every source of consolation dried, and our hearts lone and sere, till resignation breathes her soothoing calm through our souls, and with a 'still small voice,' whispers 'peace be still.' Inspiration responds, the Saviour also 'was a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.'

When we are tossed upon the foaming billows of adversity, when fortune frowns, and friend, after friend, forsakes us, and all earthly hopes are blighted, what but resignation, can still the tempest of our bosoms, and point us to 'treasures, where moth and rust do not corrupt,' and to that unfading world where friends change not? When cloven-footed slander stalks forth into the world, and with her withering touch destroys our last hopes, even staining the hitherto fair face of our characters by broad insinuations, and bold falsehood, thus wantonly robbing us of our choicest jewel, taking from us that which is more precious than much fine gold,—even 'a good name'; then is resignation indispensable to our happiness—our only anodyne.

When destroying disease has borne us down upon a bed of death, and admonishes us that the hour of dissolution is near; that the important moment will soon arrive, when earth and its loved scenes must forever fade from our view; when our longing eyes, for the last time on earth shall recognize those we love, when we shall

imprint the last kiss of affection, and that fatal word farewell, must quiver upon our dying lips for the last time, then does resignation diffuse her cheering influence through our souls, and teaches us to lean on him, who smoothes the pillow of death, and will bear us on the wings of his love, safely through the dark valley and shadow of death, to that bright world above—to our eternal home, high in the heavens, not made with hands, where, in due time, we shall join with 'every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, in saying, blessing and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever.' And resignation, or submission to the will of the wise, the unerring disposer of all events, is necessary to our happiness, in whatever situation, in this 'vale of tears'; for our lives are ever fraught with changes, and resignation enables us 'to smile on pain and wipe the tear from sorrows eye,' and always to recognize the hand of him, with whom we have to do, 'who doeth all things well.'

Impartialist.

THE DYING CHRISTIAN—An Extract.

* * * * * It was a lovely day in June, 1812, when the soft light of evening was taking the place of a brilliant sun, that I held the last conversation with this pure spirit, that was hovering on the confines of another world. She directed the conversation, all naturally, to a future existence. She gave her reasons for a full belief in it without effort, but they were full of philosophy and religion. She spoke of our fallen nature, of divine grace, and of the promises of the gospel, all connected with the immortal longings incorporated with our existence, to live beyond the grave. There was no voice of terror in it, no thrilling suggestions of punishment, but it was the soft, soul-inspiring exhortation of a departing spirit to a lover of the world. Such a lesson, such a gentle farewell, would cure the infidel of his doubt, and melt the heart of stone to water. She arose to no romantic rhapsody, such as I had witnessed in the dying hours of such as had been suddenly converted. She asked for no horses or chariots of fire to carry her up to heaven, but wished to rest her head on her Saviour's bosom, when he appeared to receive her spirit, as the angel of death was discharging his mission. In the midst of this heavenly strain, she came back to the scenes of time and sense, and breathed a sincere wish that the listener might see long and happy days, before he should be summoned to follow her. I know not how long I should have remained under the spell, if holy influences can be called a spell, if others had not come to catch her prayer and share her smiles. Her parting look I never shall forget: in that hour, all worldly ambition, all panting after wealth, fame, or human knowledge, became as the drop in the bucket, as the dust in the balance, without measure, and without regard; and although many of the dark waves of time have since rolled over me, and swept away all "trivial fond records," yet the impressions, then made, often rise to my recollection, fresh as ever.—*New-York Mirror.*

THE DEFENCE.

When nature had formed, with her all-creating breath, the loveliest of flowers, the rose, the spirit of the rose-bush, thus addressed the flower angel: "Will you not give to the gentle plant a defence, which will protect it against injury and insult? And yet nature has given the thorn-bush large and pointed thorns." "The thorn-bush," answered the angel, "does not belong to the noble, but ranked low in the kingdom of creation. Its office is to defend the slender plants from the irrational brute, and for this purpose, nature has given it the pointed

thorns. But your wish shall be gratified!" He spake, and surrounded the rose-bush with tender thorns. Then the spirit of the rose-bush said, "Why these weak weapons? They will not shelter the beautiful flower." The angel of the flowers answered him, "They shall only keep off the hand of the inconsiderate child! Resistance will be a strong allurement to the offender. That which is holy and beautiful has its defence within itself, therefore nature has given the rose the most tender weapon, which admonishes, but does not wound; for the tender unites with the beautiful." Thus, innocence possesses modesty and retirement.

THE MOURNER.

(Selected for the Messenger and Universalist.)

Hillel was walking in a moonlight night, with his disciple Sadi, in the gardens of the Mount of Olives.

Sadi said, "See yonder, that man in the light of the moon, what is he about?"

Hillel answered, "It is Zadoc; he is sitting by the grave of his son, and weeping."

"Cannot Zadoc, then," said the young man, "moderate his grief? The people call him the just and the wise."

Hillel replies, "Shall he, on this account, not feel the pain?"

"But," asked Sadi, "What advantage hath the wise man over the fool?"

Then his teacher answered, "Behold, the bitter tear of his eye falls to the earth, but his countenance is turned toward heaven."

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER

AND

PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

In presenting proposals for the third vol. of the Messenger it is merely necessary to say, that no essential change will be made in the course of the paper, unless it be to avail ourselves of every possible opportunity of increasing the talent and interest in its columns. It will, therefore, in the language it has ever held forth to the world, continue to "plead the cause of a slandered and persecuted denomination of Christians—the UNIVERSALISTS;" endeavor to inspire confidence among its friends, and to induce as far as possible the thoughtless and unconcerned, and even opposers, to come forward into the field of examination and "reason together" on the great and glorious doctrines of a world's reconciliation to God.

An interesting Discussion between Rev. E. S. Ely, (Presbyterian) and A. C. Thomas, one of the editors, is now in progress in its columns.

With unfeigned gratitude to the Universalist public for the many tokens of approbation bestowed upon our paper for the 2 years it has now been in existence, we submit these Proposals for the third volume, referring simply to the past, as a pledge for the future.

CONDITIONS.

The "N. Y. Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist," is published simultaneously in New-York and Philadelphia every Saturday morning, on a royal sheet, quarto form, and close print, at \$2 per annum, *in advance*, or \$2.50 if not paid within the first 6 months.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia will be promptly served by carriers, and all possible care will be observed in the Mailing department, that subscribers may regularly receive their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No's. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132 Chestnut-street adjoining the United States Bank.

P. PRICE, Publisher and Proprietor.

P. PRICE, PRINTER,
Nos. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham-Square,